



Section 2-156-090 ("Representation of Other Persons") prohibits a city employee from representing persons other than the city in certain situations. It prohibits a city employee from representing persons other than the city in a transaction before any city agency, economic interest in representing any person other than the city in a transaction before any city agency.

The Ethics Ordinance provisions that may limit an employee's outside work and that most bear on your question are the following:

For your general information, as staff explained, the City's Governmental Ethics Ordinance has no general provision against employees having outside work-part-time employment, which may include part-time work as an attorney. However, there are a number of provisions of the Ethics Ordinance, that restrict an employee's outside work activities. Also, as we said, City departments may impose rules stricter than the Ethics Ordinance, and at least one department does not represent any one except as required by their City attorneys who are its employees from time to time.

The Board of Ethics staff cannot answer your question with respect to the conduct of the particular person and matter you are referring to, as we do not have available to us sufficient facts.

Dear

Case No. 97053.Q

http://www.gi.ch/ill
(312) 744-5996 (T)
(312) 744-2793 (F)
(312) 744-9960
320 North Clark Street
Chicago, Illinois 60603
Room 303
Michael F. O'Rourke
Martin E. O'Donnovan
Emilly Niskin
Eileen T. Croceraan
Aungelle L. James
Vice Chair

City of Chicago
Richard M. Daley, Mayor

C O N F I D E N T I A L

December 9, 1997



the City. Other laws or rules may also apply. As we noted above, City departments may have their own rules that restrict an employee's ability to represent others in a legal matter. A department may prohibit outside representation altogether, or place limitations on it to ensure that an employee acts in a way consistent with department policy and does not create any appearance of impropriety. Also, the City's personnel rules require employees to obtain a department head's permission for outside employment; the department head may take into account a variety of factors in deciding whether to permit the outside employment! The department head may take into account for example to obtain a department head's permission for outside employment; the department head may take into account a variety of factors in deciding whether to permit the outside employment.

Section 2-156-050 ("Solicitation or Receipt of Money for Advice or Assistance") prohibits a City employee from soliciting or accepting money or anything of value in return for advice or assistance on matters concerning the operation or business of the City.

Section 2-156-030 and 2-156-080 of the Ordinance ("Improper Influence" and "Conflicts of Interest") prohibit a City employee from making or participating in, or using the employee's position to influence, a City government or agency to act in the employee's own interest or for the employee's benefit.

Under Section 2-156-020 ("Fiduciary Duty"), an employee has a duty of loyalty to the City, and, in the event of conflict, must loyally act with duties to an outside employer or client, unless always act in a way consistent with City obligations. This section also prohibits an employee from using his or her City position to promote a purely private interest.

Secti&on 2-156-090 also prohibits a city employee from having an economic interest in representing any person in a judicial or quasi-judicial proceeding before any administrative agency or court if the city is a party and that person's interest is against that of the city.

If the agency's action is discriminatory. (Employees may represent someone in a city transaction if that is part of their city job responsibilities.)

es\97053.QL

enclosures

Executive Director

Dorothy J. Eng

Approved by:

Legal Counsel

Ellen M. W. Seewell

Very truly yours,

If you have any further questions, please contact us.
brochure, for your information. Thank you for your inquiry.

Page 3
December 9, 1997
Case No. 97053.Q

51B